REMARKS

The Office Action of 12/14/2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Because of some confusion arising from prior responses regarding the claims, claims 1-11 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 12-22. Claim 14, which claims the same general subject matter as prior claim 3, has been drafted to avoid the prior indefiniteness of claim 3.

Claims 1-11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Badger in view of Englmeier. The rejections states in part:

[B] adger discloses the above claimed invention but fails to disclose that the tuner comprises at least one identifier for identifying the database field. Nonetheless, in *related art*. Englmeier discloses a receiver and system calibration system and method, comprising a tracking filter operates to provide calibration in responsive to a calibration signal, the calibration signal is communicated through the network from a centralized system and is used to update a look up table (LUT) that associated with the tracking filter. *Englmeier's system inherently existing an identifier for the network to identify it to send correct calibrate signals.*

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As far as can be ascertained from Englmeier, during a calibration routine, predetermined calibration signals or test tones are transmitted to the receiver. There is absolutely no indication in Englmeier that an identifier of any sort is transmitted in order to signal what calibration signals should be sent. There is no suggestion of any such operation, nor is there any readily-conceivable reason for such operation, which would introduce additional complexity without any identifiable benefit being obtained.

For the foregoing reasons, the rejection cannot be supported. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 12-22 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted.

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 3/13/08